DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 382 EC 110 195

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Mainstreaming. Part 2. |
| INSTITUTION | Pittsburgh Area Preschool Association, Pa. |
| PUB DATE | Mar 78 |
| NOTE | 26p.; For part 1, see EC 110 194 |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Children in Contemporary Society, P.O. Box 11173, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237 ($3.00) |
| JOURNAL CIT | Children in Contemporary Society; v11 n3 p72-94 Mar 1978 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Administrator Role; Childrens Books; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; *Legal Problems; *Mainstreaming; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Reaction; Peer Acceptance; Research Reviews (Publications); Teacher Attitudes |
| IDENTIFIERS | Education for All Handicapped Children Act |

ABSTRACT

The second of two issues addresses topics related to mainstreaming of handicapped children. Considered in nine articles are the following topics: the administrator's role; legal issues involved in the least restrictive environment specification of P.L. 94-142, the Education For All Handicapped Children Act; parents' and teachers' views regarding mainstreaming; a summary of research; a review of professional literature and resources on mainstreaming; and a description of six children's books concerning handicapped children. (CL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED153382

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# CHILDREN IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

## MAINSTREAMING PART 2

EC110195

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Frank

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

**EDITORIAL STAFF**

*Editor-In-Chief*
Mary Frank

*Executive Editor*
Karen VanderVen

---

*Managing Editor*
Pauline Medice

*Contributing Editors*
Shirley Atkins, James E. Hughes
Gary Reiswig, Judy Rubin
Ethel Tittnich

*Art Director*
Catherine Fischer

*Staff*
Stella Brown
Patricia Mekic

---

*Business Manager*
Victoria Dimidjian

*Circulation Manager*
Valerie Hildebrand

*Advertising Manager*
William Vandivier

---

*Editorial Consultant*
Margaret McFarland

*Administrative Consultant*
John E. Kyle

*Theme Consultants for this Issue*
Eleanor Barry
William R. Bauer
William Casile
Verna Hart

**Children In Contemporary Society** is a quarterly interdisciplinary journal for professionals devoted to the growth and development of young children in contemporary society.

The policy of this journal is to study various contemporary educational, social, medical, political, and economic issues which directly or indirectly influence the lives of young children. Each publication is organized around a specific issue and includes a collection of interdisciplinary readings which relate to the selected topic.

Manuscripts are welcomed if they have not been previously published. The form and content of a manuscript should follow the form as indicated in the American Psychological Association Publication Manual, 1974 Revision. Send all manuscripts to: **Children in Contemporary Society**, P.O. Box 11173, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237.

Subscriptions: U.S. $8.00
Canada and other foreign countries, $10.00.
Back Issues: $3.00 Subscriptions are also available through membership in the organization.

For information on subscriptions and membership to the Pittsburgh Area Preschool Association, address all correspondence to: **Children In Contemporary Society**, P.O. Box 11173, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237.

Selected articles from Volume 8, Numbers 1 - 4 are indexed in ERIC'S monthly abstract journal *RESOURCES IN EDUCATION*, January, 1976. These articles are available in hardback copy and microfiche which may be obtained from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Selected articles from Volume 9, Number 2 are listed in the *EXCEPTIONAL CHILD EDUCATION ABSTRACTS*, Volume 8, Number 2.

# Children In Contemporary Society

Volume 11, Number 3
March 1978

## MAINSTREAMING: PART 2

**ROLE OF THE ADMINSTRATOR**
**Mainstreaming: The Role of The Adminstrator:** 72
Richard L. St. Clair

**LEGAL ISSUES**
**"Least Restrictive Environment": P.L. 94-142:** 74
Thomas P. O'Donnell

**RESEARCH**
**Research Summary:** 76
Verna Hart

**IMPACT ON TEACHERS AND PARENTS**
**Mainstreaming: A Parent's View:** 78
Barbara Kochick
**Mainstreaming: A Parent's View:** 79
Peggy Hufnagel
**Mainstreaming: A Teacher's View:** 81
Joan Diebold
**Mainstreaming: The Voice of Discontent:** 82
George E. Maitland

**PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE**
**Professional Literature and Resources on Mainstreaming:** 84
Karen VanderVen

**CHILDREN'S LITERATURE**
**Another Lamentable Lack:** 89
Fran Cohen

**COVER DRAWING:**
Judith Rubin 92

Children In Contemporary Society is published by the Pittsburgh Area Preschool Association.

# MAINSTREAMING: THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

*by Richard L. St. Clair*

Mainstreaming is the educational process of maintaining or returning exceptional persons *who can best profit from such placement* to the regular education classroom, with all needed supportive services being provided in accordance with the nature of placement.

This definition, provided via the Pennsylvania State Board of Education Regulations (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1975), carries with it two mandates for implementation. They are as follows:

1. Intermediate units and school districts shall mainstream those exceptional persons who can profit by an appropriate program of education and/or training in a regular class.
2. When mainstreaming is recommended, specific supportive services, including staff orientation necessary for appropriate education and/or training of persons placed in the mainstream, shall be provided in accordance with the nature of the placement.

School administrators, by their positions, play a unique role in the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Act, P.L. 94-142, which was passed in 1975. By their role designation, administrators are responsible or accountable for the implementation of this law.

Leadership for mainstreaming is an administrative function which is more than the product of a philosophical point of view. In the case of mainstreaming, circa 1978, mainstreaming is a mandate of law. However, leadership is more than just accepting a new law. Leadership implies impetus, drive and follow through. Administrator leadership, thus described in the early record of P.L. 94-142, seems to be conspicuous by its absence.

Few educational issues in recent times have stirred such controversy or negative feelings among school leaders as the matter of mainstreaming. This law has not been well received in educational circles. News headlines approaching sensationalism have captured both the educator's and the lay public's eye. In public and private remarks which have found their way into print, school administrators have been less than supportive on the subject. In three articles in a September, 1977, series entitled "Mainstreaming--Sink or Swim," which appeared in *The Pittsburgh Press*, many of the negative aspects of mainstreaming were emphasized. Witness the headlines: September 4, 1977. "Can Handicapped Cope in Regular Classroom?"; September 6, 1977, "Implementing Law Confuses School"; September 7, 1977, "Paperwork Block Start of Handicap Law Here." There were few supportive comments in this long series.

The first and most important role the school adminstrator must play for mainstreaming would appear to be in the area of positive support for an approach to education which is now law. This should pose no problem when one re-examines the definition of mainstreaming. If an exceptional student can be shown to profit better from placement in regular classes, one would wonder about any educator who would not support the concept of the "best placement."

How then does one determine an individual's most appropriate educational placement? Assessment of student needs becomes a skill which administrators must sharpen. Three of ten tentative mainstreaming competencies developed by the Pennsylvania Deans Projects on Mainstreaming address this single factor. According to the project, educators in contemporary schools should be able to (a) know and understand the characteristics of exceptional children; (b) identify student behaviors that may indicate a need for special services; and (c) assess the educational needs of exceptional children to determine instructionally relevant objectives.

Upon identifying or receiving a student or students for placement in mainstreaming, an administrator who is sincerely interested in providing the most appropriate program for the student, regardless of the exceptionality, can do so only by looking to that individual's placement through the individual's educational program (IEP). The IEP will specify the exact nature of the mainstream experience.

Perhaps no area of P.L. 94-142 has caused

*Richard L. St. Clair, D.Ed., Assistant Superintendent, West Jefferson Hills School District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

administrators and teachers more confusion, anger, frustration, and negative reaction than the *mandatory* IEP. However, one needs to look beyond this bureaucratic morass. Positive leadership, which may have been lacking in the early direction of IEPs by other agencies, must be assumed by school adminstrators. The IEP is the key to the mainstream puzzle. For many administrators this key element will remain a missing Rosetta stone, its secrets locked away forever because of their own negative attitudes. For others, the Rosetta has been decoded, and mainstreaming is not really that difficult. The difference is attitude. The information found within a good IEP is vital to the placement of a student in any program. The placement of a student in the mainstream as the student's "best placement" is an evolutionary product of the IEP.

An objective examination of the ten basic parts which must be included in an IEP will yield a data based plan upon which to support decisions regarding students. The ten basic components of the IEP are (a) student's present level of achievement, (b) annual goals, (c) instruction objectives, (d) continuum of alternative services, (e) percentage of time in alternative services, (f) appropriate assesment tools, (g) agent - identification of person(s) responsible for teaching objectives, (h) materials, (i) evaluation procedures, and (j) date - projected beginning date and anticipated duration of services.

Students who are mainstreamed will need much support. They will need much positive reinforcement in the regular class without feeling patronized. These students will also need the full array of services which the school typically provides learners with problems. Depending upon the individual IEP, services as varied as basic counselling to speech and language therapy may need to be scheduled. Once again, the IEP is the blueprint. It is the key and is essential to the development of the student's total program. For mainstreamed students, all educational experiences are planned for, documented, and evaluated. A team of educators will be working on the same goal-oriented project, the IEP. By role definition, the administrator is the leader--the catalyst who assembles the team and, by leadership qualities, stimulates the team to action.

In the educational process which evolvas into good IEPs, parental involvement is a prime factor. The parent should become a partner in the development of the student's program. The parent adds suggestions and approves the IEP. The skillful administrator will involve the parent in such a way to insure the parent's psychological comfort and insure also the eventual approval of the IEP by the parent.

Skill in interpersonal relationships is essential to the positive outcome that will result in a quality IEP. Parental conferences must be conducted in supportive, non-threatening climates. If the parent has been a partner in the total process, the final conference should pose no problem. Parental conferences become problematic only when poor communications have preceded the final conference. In a situation which has been devoid of communications, one can anticipate conflict. In reality, when that has occurred, the administrator has earned conflict and confrontation.

The procedure for implementing mainstreaming in the schools is really no different than procedures for implementing any other school program. All that is really required is a reasonable understanding of the concept and the drive that is required to make any school program move. Mainstreaming is an idea whose time is now. It is therefore incumbent upon those responsible for education to be knowledgeable about mainstreaming. Positive leadership and support is essential to the movement. Teachers have varying degrees of background in mainstreaming. Pre-service teachers in most institutions are required to take course work as part of their training. Administrators, relying upon the colleges and experts on their own faculties, can bring a staff to a higher degree of awareness in a reasonable period of time. Perhaps the key ingredient to all that an administrator does in the total problem of mainstreaming students and role perception is attitude. With the proper attitude, there is no reason for mainstreaming to fail--its time is now.

## REFERENCES


Can handicapped cope in regular classroom? *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 4, 1977.

Implementing law confuses school. *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 6, 1977.

Paperwork blocks start of handicap law here. *The Pittsburgh Press*, September 7, 1977.

Pilot Model: Pennsylvania Deans' Projects Teacher Education and Mainstreaming, Mansfield State College, Mansfield, Pennsylvania, 1977.

# "LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT": P.L. 94-142

*by Thomas P. O'Donnell*

Down with "mainstreaming" -- the term, not the concept! The term mainstreaming has lost the preciseness of meaning which is requisite to its use in applying it to the requirements of P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHC), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. To teachers in the regular classroom, the term connotes "dumping" handicapped children indiscriminately into their classrooms; to school administrators, the term connotes costly renovations of buildings to make them "barrier free"; to parents of nonhandicapped children, the term connotes the draining of already diminished educational resources to accommodate the educational needs of handicapped children prior to meeting the educational needs of their children. Even among special educators the term "mainstreaming" has connotations which require defining the term before proceeding to any discussion focusing on the idea.

"Mainstreaming" is not a legal term. It will not be found in the statutory language of P.L. 94-142 or Section 504, nor will it be found in the regulatory language of either statute. The language which is used both in P.L. 94-142 and Subpart D of Section 504s regulations (Subpart D applies to preschool, elementary, secondary, and adult education program and activities.) reads:

> to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped. . . .

The regulations implementing Section 504 also generally mandate that programs and activities offered by recipients be "in the most integrated setting appropriate to the person's needs." [2] The subheading in the regulations implementing P.L. 94-142 governing considerations in placing a child is entitled "Least Restrictive Environment."

For purposes of accurately reflecting the requirements under the Federal laws, the term "mainstreaming" should be discarded, and the phrase "least restrictive environment," or the statutory language cited above, should replace it. The latter phrase is descriptively more accurate. Legally, the phrase, "least restrictive environment," is also more accurate in light of the language used in various court decisions involving the educational placement of children.

In both sets of regulations, the access of a handicapped student to an educational program is determined in the context of "appropriateness" in meeting the needs of the handicapped child for special education and related services. What is "appropriate" is determined according to the needs of the child, not the convenience of the educational agency. The regulations implementing P.L. 94-142 clarify this emphasis further by mandating that a continuum of alternative placements be available to meet the childs needs.[3] This continuum of alternative placements includes regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction in hospitals and institutions. In considering the continuum, provisions for supplementary services to be provided with *regular class* placement is also a factor.[4] Further placement as close as possible to the child's home and in the school he or she would attend if not handicapped are factors to be considered under the regulations implementing P.L. 94-142.[5] The regulations implementing Section 504 reiterate the consideration of a placement in proximity to the child's residence in determining educational placements for handicapped children. [6]

**the term "mainstreaming should be discarded, and the phrase "least restrictive environment"...should replace it.**

The EAHC regulations provide the touchstone for when a handicapped child can be placed in special classes or separate schooling. Such removal from the regular educational environment "occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of

*Thomas P. O'Donnell, Esquire: Staff Attorney, National Center for Law and The Handicapped, Inc., South Bend, Indiana.*

supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." [7] This decision would be made as a result of the evaluation process and as an end product of the meetings held to develop a child's individualized education program (IEP). The educational placement should not be decided on the basis of what the educational agency has available.

This latter consideration has been given some weight by school authorities because of the change in the language in the final regulations governing the content of the individualized education program made by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). BEH removed a parenthetical statement from the proposed regulations which had specified that the IEP was to include "a statement of specific educational services needed by the child, (determined without regard to the availability of those services). . . ." [8] With the removal of the parenthetical statement many school authorities surmised that they must now only include those programs in existence at the time the IEP is developed. BEH has clarified their position in this regard. [9] As they indicate, the language of the statute is clear. For example, the definition of "special education" means "specially designed instruction,. . . to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, . . ." [10] Under the Section 504 regulations, "appropriate education" means:

> . . . the provision of regular or special education and related aids and services that are designed to meet individual educational needs of handicapped persons. . . . [11]

In neither statute nor sets of regulations are there references made to consideration of an educational placement only in existing programs. Certainly consideration of existing programs is one factor, but only a factor. This factor, and others, must always be measured against meeting the unique needs of the handicapped child. The creation of new programs and activities may well be the result of a conscientious effort to meet a child's, or group of children's, educational needs.

To sum up, the educational placement of a handicapped child not only involves consideration of meeting the unique needs of that child in terms of education, regular or special, and related services, but also the physical location of where the child will be placed. This consideration will mean that educational agencies must review their programs and activities in light of the requirements of program accessibility mandated under HEW's Section 504 regulations.

Regular schools, as recipients of federal financial assistance, may need to make structural modifications in order to meet the accessibility requirements. The regulations do not require that each facility or every part of a facility be accessible. Programs and activities, however, must be, on the whole, readily accessible to handicapped persons. Suggestions are given for methods that might be used to accomplish access to programs. These include the redesign of equipment, reassignment of classes or other services to accessible buildings, assignment of aides, and home visits. Although the guidelines for program accessibility are flexible, the regulations clearly state that a public school district may not make only one building accessible if it results in the segregation of handicapped students. [12]

The deadline for completion of major structural changes is June 2, 1980; however, program accessibility is required immediately. In reviewing their facilities, schools may find that many structural changes can be made quickly and economically. HEW has taken the position that such changes must be implemented as soon as possible. [13] Certainly, any new school buildings constructed after June 3, 1977, must be readily accessible to and usable by handicapped persons. [14]

In developing the IEP for a handicapped child, all parties involved must review the possibilities of placement of that child in the regular school closest to the child's residence. The placement of that child elsewhere must be reflected as necessary and appropriate to that child's needs, not the convenience of the educational agency nor the inconvenience to that educational agency in structurally modifying the building to meet program accessibility requirements under Section 504 regulations or creating a new program to meet that child's needs in a school in close proximity to the child's home. Remember, to the maximum extent appropriate the child is to be placed with nonhandicapped children.

All of the preceding remarks may, indeed, be a restatement of the general principles of

(Continued on page 93)

# MAINSTREAMING:

# A PARENT'S VIEW

*by Barbara Kochick*

As the parent of a retarded child and as a former teacher, I have more than just a casual interest in mainstreaming. It is my opinion that if a child has the academic skills, physical coordination, and/or manual dexterity required to succeed in a regular class then that child should be included in a regular classroom. Of course, the appropriate resources that a special child needs should be available. If a child cannot make it in the regular classroom because of a mental or physical disability, or the inability to deal with the stigma of a handicap or with social pressures, then that child should not be included in the regular program. Of course, it is not this simple, and any placement program requires careful consideration, planning, and supervision by parents and by all professionals involved with each individual student. A handicapped child who has an ability that is close to that of the other nonhandicapped children and is motivated to succeed will not be a burden to the teacher. The best student I have ever had was one with intelligence test scores in the below average range but who was so highly motivated that she performed and produced work much better than those with scores in the gifted range.

Successful mainstreaming would give the handicapped child and the nonhandicapped child the opportunity to function together. This is an immense social benefit to both groups and can be an important part of life-time character building lessons.

Centers for special children should not be the dumping grounds for any child who presents too much of a problem or challenge to the regular school system. On the other hand, these centers should not be eliminated; they have a vital function in the total educational program. There are those individuals whose varied problems make it virtually impossible for them to benefit from the regular classroom program. Society is best served by placing them in a program that can be highly individualized and where

(Continued on page 80)

*Barbara Kochick: Parent of a handicapped child, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

# MAINSTREAMING:

# A PARENT'S VIEW

*by Peggy Hufnagel*

*Peggy Hufnagel: Parent of a handicappea child, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

The special public school which our physically handicapped daughter attended catered to the mentally retarded, although one wing was assigned to the physically handicapped. This wing had three classrooms, a physical therapy room, and specially designed lavatories. It served students from ages 5 to 21 in classes of approximately 10 children, who were instructed on an individual or on a grade level basis. School policy dictated that a child would remain with the same teacher for at least four years and be advanced with his peer group rather than on academic achievement. The school often placed emotionally disturbed children, who were often abusive to the other children in the same class with the physically or sensory handicapped children.

Aside from periodic medical problems, our daughter's first three years in the special school went very well. As parents, we had a good rapport with the teacher and we worked well together. However, toward the end of her third year, we noticed academic problems. We questioned the teacher as to whether she felt our daughter was being challenged enough and requested that she be advanced to the next class. It was decided that because of her age, she could be moved up to the next class.

The year began satisfactorily, but as it progressed, we could tell our daughter was not happy and was not performing well academically. When the teacher was approached, she stated there was not any problem except that our daughter was not doing her work. When we asked for homework, so we could help her, the teacher never responded. At this point, our daughter began to have a lot of fake illnesses such as headaches, stomach aches, and, generally, did not want to go to school. When a real medical problem arose there was a definite indifference on the part of the teacher. It was at this point that we knew a change would be necessary.

We began to check with her doctors and

(Continued on page 80)

(Continued from page 78)

the professionals are specifically trained to work with such individuals. Not all children can fit neatly into the established educational system but the system should be flexible enough to accommodate those children whose abilities are outside its perimeter. Every child has the right to be placed in the most appropriate program. Parents and professional educators have the responsibility of seeing they are placed there.

My son Jeffrey is currently attending Valley Child Development Center, a private school, where he is involved in a program which includes some principles of mainstreaming. During various portions of the day he is integrated with normal children and those with other types of handicaps. These sessions are important in teaching him to interact with, tolerate, and understand other children. I can also see in the reactions of the other children that it is also a learning experience for them; they have learned to be gentle and helpful with him and they now accept him as a part of the group without questioning his odd behavior. However, he is also involved in a highly individualized program which takes up the other part of his day. His program contains goals that pertain only to him and would not be applicable to any other child in the group.

Next year he will be of school age. Currently he does not verbalize and his coordination and dexterity are at a very low level. Even with large amounts of special help it would be impossible for him to succeed in a regular classroom. So, he will be attending a special center where the program is the most appropriate for him at this time.

(Continued from page 79)

her physical therapist and to question our daughter as to whether she would like to go to another school. The response from each was very good. Our daughter was excited about the possibility of going to school with her brothers and sister, although she would miss her friends at her old school. Because she herself seemed to realize a change would be best, this made it easier for all of us. The doctor and therapist also agreed that she was ready for a change.

Our other children had been attending a parochial school and it was there that we wished to send our handicapped daughter. We approached the administration of the school to investigate the possibilities. Apprehension was the first reaction of the principal but after reviewing the situation, she became more receptive to the idea. In our case we were fortunate that many teachers already knew our daughter from seeing her in church.

Again we discussed with the principal the academic program, her learning disabilities and lack of background, the physical layout problems which existed, and if these problems could be worked out in a regular school. The principal became very receptive and felt that the school could be of great help to her and likewise felt that our daughter's being in the school would be a benefit to all the other children.

Having opened the door to the possibility of mainstreaming our daughter, the principals of each school conferred, and the teacher who would have her in the regular school observed her in class. Through this observation, the parochial school teachers agreed with us that she was not being stimulated in the special school.

The transition into the parochial school was a beautiful one. The teachers on her first day treated her as if she had been there all along, which made it easier. Her peers then accepted her in the same manner. Of course, she is often asked why she wears braces and is in a wheelchair, but she answers each question as it arises. Although it was not easy for her or for us, we were determined it could work if we all united and worked together.

Since attending regular school, there has been tremendous growth academically, emotionally, and psychologically for our daughter as well as a deeper appreciation of her by her brothers and sisters. However, there are still many problems to overcome. Because of the long periods of time spent in the hospital and special school, our daughter has a difficult time relating to her own peer group. She does not know how to converse and share the interest of children her age, although she gets along well with adults.

We have found that she has learned how to effectively manipulate the sympathy of many of her teachers. As is true with most handicapped children, she is able to preceive sympathy in a voice or in a sympathetic glance and can use it effectively to get out of work. I've had teachers tell me they know she is capable of doing more but they don't want to upset her. Unfortunately this hurts the child more.

It is most important in working with handicapped that the teacher see the child and not the handicap. Our daughter told me she wants to be treated the same as her peers, with the same privileges and punish-

(Continued on page 93)

# MAINSTREAMING: A TEACHER'S VIEW

*by Joan Diebold*

Upon my learning that mainstreaming was to become law, my first reaction was, "Impossible!" I have been a special education teacher for five years. I thought of the children in special schools and the wide range of services that are provided for them in their semi-restricted settings. How could these students get these same services in a regular classroom and how would the other children in these rooms react? I made the immediate decision that these students should remain in this special environment for the remainder of their educational years.

**...it can take place simply and realistically with everyone's cooperation and acceptance.**

Recently, however, while enrolled in an area university in-service program dealing with mainstreaming, I was forced to reconsider my previous decision. I thought back to my student teaching when I had been assigned to the fifth grade in an inner city school which had no programs for the educable mentally retarded or the learning disabled, and they were included in a regular classroom. This class, therefore, had a broad range of different abilities, and it seemed necessary to teach in a more individualized manner.

In retrospect, mainstreaming was, in fact, occurring in that classroom. The realization that all students in the class had different learning potentials forced me to adjust and adapt my methods. Perhaps my training in special education made recognition and adaptation easier, but every teacher has a few students who when presented with new material seem to scream out, "I can't!" This feeling, easily seen in the expressions on their faces, can be noticed by the teacher early in the year.

In this fifth grade classroom, I used various kinds of worksheets for different abilities. For example, students with average or above average ability were given worksheets that involved a little more research and thought while other children merely had to pick the correct answers from multiple choice questions. We also did a lot of role playing where students took the part of the various people in a particular history lesson. This was very helpful for the students who had trouble reading and remembering the lesson and was fun for everyone. The class never seemed to notice that the program was individualized or that some children were receiving more help. The principal was to use whatever resources available to bring everyone to a satisfactory degree of mastery in fifth grade social studies.

Some of these resources came from the students themselves. Many of the students enjoyed teaching others. This peer-tutoring approach helped not only the slower student but also gave the student taking the role of the teacher more confidence. Also, when the child had explained the material to another, he/she often had an even better understanding of the lesson. As you can see, many of the adaptations made necessary by the wide range of student abilities benefited and enriched all the students whether handicapped or not.

When I said that this class was an example of mainstreaming, I meant in a very limited way. There were no supportive services or resources available as there will be in the new mainstreaming program. However, even without such services it was workable.

Today's mainstreaming program, as I understand it, will provide the classroom teacher with supportive services such as resource teachers, resource centers with materials to help the teacher adapt his/her existing program to suit the handicapped child, special teachers to work with the children on a part-time basis to reinforce the classroom teacher's lessons, and in-service programs to help the teacher recognize learning styles. In addition, the in-service programs will suggest ways the teacher can present material with these identified learning styles as a guide.

All of this should make mainstreaming "possible" and with no fear on the part of the teacher, the handicapped student, or the other students in the class. I believe it can take place simply and realistically with everyone's cooperation and acceptance.

*Joan Diebold, M.S. in Elementary and Special Education: Teacher, Mon Valley School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

# MAINSTREAMING:

# THE VOICE OF DISCONTENT

*by George E. Maitland*

From the first outcry for integration of the handicapped into regular public school classrooms, to the passage of Public Law 94-142 with its mandates for equal educational opportunities and placement in least restrictive alternatives, a long, hard struggle has been waged for the rights of handicapped children. Despite widespread celebration of victory, the passing of this so--called "quiet revolution" might actually be a harbinger of an even greater struggle--the battle to firmly establish and implement appropriate practices (Abeson & Zettel, 1977). While recent trends seem to indicate that the 70--odd year history of self-contained special education classes as the dominant service delivery model for handicapped children has ended, a declaration to this effect might be premature. As yet, it is unclear how the intent of the law and the philosophy of the mainstreaming movement will be implemented inside the schoolhouse door.

Further prohibiting a firm pronouncement is an alarming "mainstreaming backlash" that is increasingly detectable among a number of professionals, classroom teachers, and, surprisingly enough, parents of handicapped children. Just as discontent grew over the past decade with the traditional means of educating exceptional children and led to serious rethinking of past assumptions, an equally strong discontent with the realities of mainstreaming and the challenges of P.L. 94-142 is building and endangers recent attainments in the education of handicapped children.

This backlash must be taken seriously for as Hobbs (1975) has noted, legal mandates (*likewise philosophies*) do not fulfill themselves--they must rely on other implementation. An air of resistance among a significant portion of the educational community charged with making mainstreaming a reality would no doubt have negative effects on its fulfillment. These voices of discontent warrant consideration, especially since the success of any innovation is as much dependent upon the ability and willingness of those involved to effect change as it is on their competency to implement change.

### Professional Discontent

While pronouncements of dissatisfaction and calls for caution have been advanced, few special educators have gone so far as to advocate complete abandonment of the mainstreaming movement. However, critics of the movement are demanding that before the "faddish dash" to mainstream children is continued several crucial assumptions must be put to the test. Foremost among these is the assumption that mainstreaming is an effective educational procedure. To date, mainstreaming is simply a popular yet unproven educational alternative. It lacks a sound evidentiary basis (Keogh & Levitt, 1976). Consequently, the impetus behind mainstreaming has been predominantly political with little indication of how children are affected by the process (MacMillan & Semmel, 1977). On the basis of this shortcoming Polloway and Shell (1975), among others, call for an evaluation of the practical effects of mainstreaming before current special education practices are abandoned and the mainstreaming concept is universally adopted. Lippman (1977), in response to the "bandwagon" appeal of mainstreaming, points out another professional concern with the movement. As with many concepts within the field of special education (e.g., learning disabilities, hyperactivity, etc.), once a term such as mainstreaming enters the professional vocabulary it often loses its meaning and becomes educational jargon. The term then begins to function as a flaglike symbol which elicits and automatic "emotional salute" rather than thoughtful consideration of a concept that could lead to meaningful social change for handicapped children. As such, from the standpoint of a number of professionals, mainstreaming is a concept with incomplete rationale, haphazard planning, and unproven pedagogy; yet, it is passionately embraced by a majority (Winschel, 1976).

*George E. Maitland, Ed.D.: Assistant Professor, Division of Specialized Professional Development, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

### Regular Education Discontent

Regular educators, caught in the sweeping tide of legal mandates and public opinion, have also begun to question the practice of mainstreamed education. They have been more adamant and certainly more vocal than special educators in expressing their concerns. Rightfully so, since mainstreaming places the onus of educating the nation's handicapped, once again, (recall the days prior to special education services) in the lap of regular education. In response to this challenge, many classroom teachers, who perhaps have been overreminded that they are "regular" rather than "special" educators, question their ability to meet the often complex and perplexing academic and social difficulties of handicapped children without additional training. Even if adequate specialized preparation is provided via in-service education, regular educators express the overriding concern that they simply won't have time to plan and implement individual programs to the extent required by law. These time factor concerns are especially relevant for educators in localities that do not possess the necessary support services to deal with the presence of handicapped learners along with 20 to 30 other children. Some regular educators insist that the whole movement is a cop-out on the part of special education and that it will so increase the scope of regular educations' responsibility that the majority of the classroom will suffer. The ominous cloud of accountability and the fear of becoming the "burial ground" that once characterized special education are also disconcerting to regular educators. These and other concerns reflect a growing suspicion that mainstreaming is not the practical and feasible solution to the problems of handicapped learners that it initially appeared to be.

### Parental Discontent

Parents of exceptional children and youth as well as professional educators have played a major role in securing funds, appropriate educational services, and equal educational opportunities for their children. Indeed they were at the forefront of the mainstreaming revolution. For this reason it is somewhat surprising that parents have begun to express their discontent with the process. Schleifier (1977) has depicted one situation which unfortunately is becoming less uncommon. A six-year-old female with cerebral palsy had experienced great success in a self-contained program conducted by trained personnel with access to specialized rehabilitative equipment. When her district adopted whole sale mainstreaming and she was returned to a regular classroom, the youngster experienced a halt in progress, moodiness and general unhappiness, and a regression in physical abilities. Not only was frustration exhibited by the child but also by her parents and school personnel. The school principal and the classroom teacher were unable to provide the depth of attention required by the child and as a result of their inadequacies a very hostile home--school relationship developed. The child's parents were distraught because the years of seeking appropriate educational services for their daughter had resulted in something a great deal less than expected. Many parents of the handicapped are suffering through similar experiences and as a result are expressing their dissatisfaction with the results of mainstreaming. Their long, hard struggle has simply created an additional chance for their children to experience educational estrangement and failure (Winschel, 1977).

### Summary

While mainstreaming has captured enthusiastic and widespread acceptance as the primary model for educating most exceptional children and is clearly a majority movement, it is obvious from the preceding that it has not gone without criticism. This certainly should not be unexpected since with any new concept (especially an educational one) one expects some degree of discontent to be the rule rather than the exception. You cannot satisfy everybody. However, the questioning and discontent is growing and the eminent threat of a mainstreaming backlash movement with a broad base of support is a clear and present danger.

At this juncture we have two choices. One, we can ignore the criticisms and stand by our intuitive convictions that unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, pupils should be educated in the mainstream--if for them it is the appropriate educational accommodation based on their demonstrated needs. In short, we can stonewall it. Or, two, we can accept the discontent as a reflection of genuine problems and attack them head on in an attempt to win an appropriate education for handicapped children. As the Deputy Commissioner of Education - Bureau of Edu-

(Continued on page 94)

# PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE AND RESOURCES ON MAINSTREAMING

*by Karen VanderVen*

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) has suddenly jackknifed the concept of mainstreaming into the consciousness of those delivering services to children. However, study of the concept within the special education field over the past decade or so means that those suddenly finding themselves responsible for implementing new programming based on the regulations will not find themselves without written resources to aid them in gathering information and evaluating the many issues associated with the task. The available literature on mainstreaming is, in fact, immense. Rather than having to search out materials hastily written in response to a suddenly fashionable idea, readers will need to sort through voluminous writings--some old, many very current--from a variety of sources. This effort should prove worthwhile, however, since mainstreaming is not only a humanistic concept which most will want to support, but also a highly complex issue which is surrounded by controversy. Implementation of mainstreaming will undoubtedly be more successful if those working with it are familiar with its various facets. The following discussion will identify some examples of the sources of information on mainstreaming and the various aspects they cover.

**Definition and Philosophical Bases of Mainstreaming**

While the currency of the term mainstreaming indicates that it is frequently used, it is nonetheless important to recognize its precise meanings, for, as MacMillan, Jones and Meyers (1976) point out, "our entry into the new era has its confusion and its uncertainties, as is evident in the attempt to find a consensus definition" (p. 3). This article provides a detailed examination of the factors which should be considered in defining mainstreaming along with a working definition. Reger (1974) in "What Does Mainstreaming Mean?" also examines it and proposes a flexible conceptualization which suggests both advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming and ways in which positive programming can be achieved. A specific contribution to the articulation of the various levels and forms of special education service delivery, including mainstreaming models, is proposed by Deno (1970) and helps to address the point made by Reger (1974) that "not all children can, in fact, be mainstreamed" (p. 58).

A survey of the literature suggests that the philosophical issues which have propelled mainstreaming to the forefront as a program design are centered around labelling and normalization. Perhaps the most extensive explication of normalization, which is a way of designing services for handicapped individuals which integrates them into the culturally normative mainstream of life rather than reinforcing deviancy through various practices which segregate or otherwise dehumanize, is that of Wolfensberger (1972). Wolfensberger, who developed the concept of normalization, supports mainstreaming as an example of it. *The Futures of Children* by Nicholas Hobbs (1975) examines in depth both the advantages and disadvantages of diagnostic and classification labels placed on children which serve as a basis for program placement, indicating that on one hand diagnostic terms help children gain access to resources but on the other hand can restrict them from full opportunity by unnecessarily stigmatizing them. A recognition of the pitfalls of labelling supports mainstreaming: "The incorporation of exceptional children in regular classrooms is harmonious with a guiding assumption of this report: that exceptional children should participate to the maximum extent in the normal activities of childhood" (p.196), while still being "wary of the preemptive power of the term 'mainstreaming' for fear that like other labels heavy with surplus meaning it will legitimize abandoning exceptional children to undifferentiated classroom programs" (p. 197).

*Karen VanderVen, Ph.D.: Associate Professor, Department of Child Development and Child Care, School of Health Related Professions, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

### Practical Programming In Mainstreaming

While recognizing that the meaning and philosophical basis of mainstreaming is necessary to implement it effectively, most teachers are also seeking useful guidelines for classroom work. Fortunately, the resources in this area are abundant. One of the most recent is Meisels' "First Steps in Mainstreaming" (1977) which provides, in addition to an articulate coverage of many basic background issues, a compendium of very practical suggestions for facilitating positive interaction between normal and handicapped children. Other works dealing specifically with programming include *Making It Work: Practical Ideas for Integrating Exceptional Children Into Regular Classes* (Aiello, 1976), *Not All Little Wagons Are Red: The Exceptional Child's Early Years* (Jordan & Dailey, 1973), *Teacher, Please Don't Close the Door: The Exceptional Child in the Mainstream* (Jordan, 1976) and *An Administrator's Handbook of Special Education: A Guide to Better Education for the Handicapped* (Wirtz, 1977). Among the growing number of publications focusing specifically on the physical environment of the handicapped is *Places and Spaces X Facility Planning for Handicapped Children* (Aiello, 1976).

### Mainstreaming Specific Groups of Handicapped Children

While the trend towards eschewing diagnostic labelling in favor of functional descriptions may be reducing the categorization of handicapped children into subgroups, there still exist realistic differences which, if pinpointed, can contribute towards more effective programming. A major source of information of various handicaps is *Mainstreaming: Program Descriptions in Areas of Exceptionality--A Selective Bibliography* (Council for Exceptional Children, 1976) which is an annotated listing of more than 200 abstracts covering such areas as retardation, emotional disturbance, giftedness, learning disability, visual and aural impairment, and others.

*Hearing Impaired Children in the Mainstream* (Birch, 1976) and the provocative *New York Times* article "Can Schools Speak the Language of the Deaf" (Greenburg & Doolittle, 1977) are among the writings on children with aural difficulties, while works concerning children with visual impairments include *Supporting Visually Impaired Students in the Mainstream: The State of the Art* as a most recent book to have been published by the Council for Exceptional Children in August, 1977. "Mainstreaming the Mildly Retarded: Some Questions, Cautions and Guidelines" (MacMillan, Jones and Meyers, 1976), and another publication of the Council for Exceptional Children, *Mainstreaming: Educable Retarded Children in Regular Classes* by Dr. Jack Birch (1975), cover work with intellectually impaired youngsters. Other publications on specific diagnostic groups are *Mainstreaming Emotionally Disturbed Children* (Pappanikou and Paul, 1977) and *Mainstreaming and the Minority Child* (Jones and Wilderson, 1976).

### Teacher Training

Scrutinizers of the prospective success of mainstreaming, with its appeal to humanistic values, have consistently contended that there must be an incisive plan for educational preparation of those who are to directly implement it if it is to succeed.

The need for educational programs to make an impact on adult attitudes is underscored by a report cited in *Human Behavior* (Parrish, Reece & Piscitello, 1977) which describes a study of attitudes of education student towards atypical children after having taken a special education course. Results showed that while attitudes towards physically handicapped children improved, negative feelings towards mentally retarded and learning disabled children did not change. The authors suggest that training efforts must attempt to make an impact on trainee attitudes and that the quantity of education may have to exceed one course. Further support for these points is made by Valletutti (1969) who emphasizes that the real issue in achieving successful mainstreaming is not that of segregation vs. integration, but rather the attitudes towards deviance held by those who work with the children being served.

Unfortunately, much remains to be done, as cited by Zemanek and Lehrer (1977) who state, "Amidst the controversies that have resulted from the development of mainstreaming programs, little has been said about how university departments of special education can deal with the major issues that have recently surfaced" (p. 377). Among their proposals for content to be included in training workers in mainstreaming is identification and screening procedures, instructional techniques and materials appropriate for

different kinds of exceptional children, use of supportive staff and services, and curriculum development skills. The authors also suggest that special education departments be involved in the broader, systemic activities of mainstreaming, such as research, evaluation, training of other personnel, and integration of resources at administrative and legislative levels.

One step toward implementing specific educational preparation is described by Wolf (1975) in *Designing and Implementing a Mainstream Course for Regular Early Educators*, which presents a specific course for preparing teachers with normal children to work also with handicapped children. The course covered rationale and philosophy of mainstreaming and various aspects of mainstreaming programming such as parent involvement, attitudes and myths concerning handicapped children, behavior management and programming skills, and identification and assessment methods. A course evaluation indicated trainee interest in the additional areas of resources, planning models, and legal issues.

The limited quantity of material on teacher preparation for mainstreaming suggests that this is a ripe area for further dissemination; those who have covered it stress its significance in the total mainstreaming effort.

**Evaluation**

Probably least represented in the mammoth literture on mainstreaming are reports presenting empirical data evaluating the impact of mainstreaming on both the normal and atypical children involved. As Guralnick (1976) states "Unfortunately, research designed to identify the specific conditions unique to the mainstreamed setting that related to the development of the handicapped child is very limited" (p. 237), while Peterson and Haralick (1977) agree saying, "Very limited empirical research has been reported to date regarding the social and play behavior of handicapped and nonhandicapped children in integrated preschool settings" (p. 235). Both of the articles containing these statements continue to present the results of interesting and significant data-based studies which have tremendous implications for effective classroom programming, suggesting that there are many play, socialization, and interaction variables that can be empirically scrutinized (Peterson and Haralick) and that interaction among children must be carefully and systematically facilitated (Guralnick).

**Legislative Issues in Mainstreaming**

The teacher or worker who is in fact interested in detailed information on the legislative background of mainstreaming will have ample material available; in keeping with the general trend towards recognition of the strong relationship between political and administrative factors and children's services, much attention is given in the mainstreaming literature to presenting and interpreting its legislative basis. A report, *Educating All Handicapped Children*, (available from the Nation School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209) provides an in-depth analysis of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act which includes a consideration of its implications for local and state education providers, while *Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children* (Weintraub, Abeson, Ballard, & Lavor, 1976) offers a description of the rights of atypical children, various levels of legislative activity on their behalf, and advocacy for handicapped children.

An interesting scrutiny of mainstreaming from the perspective of unionized teachers, showing the relationship between mainstreaming policies and collective bargaining agreements of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association has been prepard by Sobesky (1976). His analysis suggests that in general the policies of the two organizations support the concept of mainstreaming.

**Special Resources**

While academic programs may be lagging in responding to the inception of mainstreaming with formal courses and curricula, there are available for those involved in some form of training a variety of training resources developed by a professional organizations and commercial publishers of educational materials. The Council For Exceptional Children's offerings include *All Together Now* (1974), a cassette album covering various aspects of mainstreaming through presentations by administrators, trainers, and teachers and *Mainstreaming: Teacher Training Workshop in Individualized Instruction*, a training resource containing workshops on relevant areas such as diagnostic techniques and presriptive teaching activities.

Learning Concepts has also developed mainstreaming training materials. *Mainstreaming Training Series*, edited by Dr. Thomas Fairchild, includes content on individualized educational programming (IEP), mainstreaming law, and parents, utilizing as learning experiences role play guides, cases, simulations, and other teaching strategies.

A multimedia program which includes a text and a "mediapak" with filmstrips along with a trainer's guide on various aspects of mainstreaming for use with teachers is published by Charles E. Merrill. Films on mainstreaming are also available; among them is *Individualized Educational Programming* prepared by Instructional Media (1977).

**General Information Resources**

The advent of mainstreaming has been responded to by the interest of numerous agencies, councils, and other organizations, which provide valuable resources.

The Coordinating Council for Handicapped Children (407 S. Dearborn St., Rm. 1075, Chicago, Ill. 66605) publishes materials for parents, teachers, and others involved in working with handicapped children. Content includes legal rights and ways of achieving them. Closer Look, the National Information Center for the Handicapped, a project of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, (Box 1492, Washington, D.C. 20013) serves as an information center for parents of handicapped children as a source of practical guidance. Content of materials prepared by the National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped includes individualized education plans; further information and a catalog are available from Information Services, National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

A variety of resources (books, inservice training materials, films, and other materials) are published by The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Va. 22091 and are described in its 1977-1978 catalog. The Council for Exceptional Children is also the home of the National Institute of Education--sponsored ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) on exceptional children, which is designed to make available information on research and other projects in education which may not always be disseminated in traditional books and journals.

A useful listing of publications on various aspects of work with handicapped children appeared in the June, 1977, *Amicus*, a publication of the National Center for Law and the Handicapped, while two issues of the journal *Exceptional Parent* (August and October, 1977) are devoted to mainstreaming

The Wynne Associates conducted an analysis of 291 books and other materials related to preschool age handicapped children and prepared a report on its work for the Bureau of Education for the handicapped. The book, *Mainstreaming and Early Childhood Education for Handicapped Children: Review and Implications for Research*, is available from the Wynne Associates at 3915 Livingston St. N. W., Washington, D.C. 20015.

Note: Special acknowledgment is extended to Diane Brinskc, student in the Department of Child Development and Child Care, University of Pittsburgh, for assistance in gathering materials utilized in preparation of this article.

**REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Aiello, B., (Ed.). *Making it work: Practical ideas for integrating exceptional children into regular classes.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Aiello, B., (Ed.). *Places and spaces: Facility planning for exceptional children.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Bibliography of educational materials. *Amicus.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Law and the Handicapped, June 1977.

Birch, J. Hearing impaired children in the mainstream. Reston, Va.: Council for Exception Children, 1975.

Birch, J. Mainstreaming educable mentally retarded children in regular classes. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Birch, J. & Johnstone, B. Designing schools and schooling for the handicapped. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

*CEC catalog 1977-78 publications and nonprint media.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Cohen, S. Integrating children with handicaps into early childhood education programs. *Children Today*, January-Feb-

ruary 1975.

Deno, S. Special education as developmental capital. *Exceptional Children,* 1970, **37**[3], 229-40.

Dunlop, K. Mainstreaming: Valuing diversity in children. *Young Children,* May 1977, **32**[4], 26-32.

*Educating all handicapped children.* Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1977.

Fairchild T., (Ed.). *Mainstreaming training Series.* Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts.

Glockner, M. Integrating handicapped children into regular classrooms. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education.

Greenberg, J. & Doolittle, G. Can schools speak the language of the deaf? *New York Times Magazine,* December 11, 1977.

Guralnick, M. The value of integrating handicapped and nonhandicapped preschool children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* April 1976, **46**[2], 236-245.

Hennon, M. *Identifying handicapped children for child development programs.* Atlanta, Ga.: Humanics Press, 1977.

Hobbs, N. *The future of children:Categories, labels and their consequence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Jones, R., & Wilderness, F. *Mainstreaming and the minority child.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Jordan, J., (Ed.). *Teacher, please don't close the door:The exceptional child in the mainstream.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Jordan, J., & Dailey, R., (Eds.) *Not all little wagons are red: The exceptional child in the mainstream.* Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Kleinfield, S. The handicapped: Hidden no longer. *The Atlantic Monthly,* December 1977, 86-96.

Levine, D. The dangers of early identification. *Child Care Quarterly,* 1973, **2**[4].

MacMillan, D., Jones, R., & Meyers, C. Mainstreaming the mildly retarded: Some questions, cautions and guidelines. *Mental Retardation,* Febrauary 1976, **14**[1], 3-10.

*Mainstreaming and early childhood education for handicapped children: Review and implications for research.* Washington. D.C.: Wynne Associates.

Mainstreaming: Program descriptions in areas of exceptionality: A selective bibliography. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

*Mainstreaming: Teacher training workshops in individualized instruction.* Reston, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Mainstreaming. *The Exceptional Parent,* August 1977.

Mainstreaming. *The Exceptional Parent,* October 1977.

Meisels, S. First steps in mainstreaming. *Young Children,* November 1977, **33**[1], 4-13.

Pappanikou, J., & Paul, J., (Eds.). *Mainstreaming emotionally disturbed children.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1977.

Parrish, I., Reece, N., & Piscitello, M. Mainstream Stigma. *Human Behavior,* February, 1977, **21**.

Paul, J., Turnbull, A., & Cruickshank, W. *Mainstreaming: A practical guide.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1977.

Peterson, N., & Haralick, J. Integration of handicapped and non-handicapped preschoolers: An analysis of play behavior and social interaction. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded,* October 1977, **12**[3], 235-245.

Roger, R. What does mainstreaming mean? *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* October 1974, **7**[8], 57-59.

Reynolds, M., (Ed.). *Mainstreaming: Origins and implications.* Reston, Va.: Council on Exceptional Children, 1976.

Sobesky, W., Simpkins, E., & LaPlant, F. *Teachers unions on mainstreaming.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116278).

Sobesky, W., Simpkins, E., & LaPlant, F. *Supporting visually impaired students in the mainstream: The state of art.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Valletutti, P. Integration vs. segregation: A useless dialectic. *Journal of special Education,* 1969, **3**[4], 405-409.

Weintraub, F., Abeson, A., Ballard, J., & LaVor, M. *Public policy and the education of exceptional children.* Reston, Va.: Council on Exceptional Children, 1976.

Wirtz, M. *An administrators handbook of*

(Continued on page 93)

# ANOTHER LAMENTABLE LACK

*by Fran Cohen*

*Fran Cohen's original article "A Lamentable Lack" was published in Children In Contemporary Society, Volume 10, Number 3, March, 1977. Theme: Economic Issues and Young Children.*

Hundreds of picture books for preschool children are published each year. Yet, when one consults the *Subject Guide to Children's Books In Print*, over 7000 categories are listed and "books for the handicapped preschooler" isn't one of them; in *Best Books For Children*, there are 600 titles with-0 for the handicapped child; in *A Parent's Guide to Children's Reading*, 2 out of well over a 100 are relevant and these are at the elementary, not the preschool level. There a fewer still, less than a handful, which allude to the interaction of the handicapped perschooler with his "normal" peers. Only one, *Jon O*, deals specifically with the mainstreaming of a handicapped preschooler.

This lamentable lack exists despite the fact that over two years have elapsed since the court ruled that handicapped children are entitled to free public education in the "least restrictive" environment possible and since the Headstart Program was required to accept 10% of its population from the ranks of the handicapped and to integrate them into the regular classroom.

Out of the general population "one out of a hundred couples will have a handicapped child born to them" (Garver, 1974, p. 11). Mattern (1974) estimates that about 100,000 babies are born annually who have serious birth defects. Disease and accident augment this number. Additionally, there are those preschoolers who are noticeably different from their peers in appearance and/or abilities to the extent that the effect and affect constitute at least a temporary disability. We find then that there is a sizeable population, one which certainly should warrant the publication of such picture books from a commercial standpoint.

Three points have been established now:

1) The books in question are not on the market.
2) Some handicapped preschoolers are by law entitled to, and do in fact, attent regular preschool classrooms.
3) The number of handicapped preschoolers is great enough to constitute a reasonable market for books with which they can specifically identify themselves.

A most important fourth point exists, namely, that of the value of such books--the purpose they could and would serve. It is contained in the word "bibliotherapy," i.e., treating with, or through books. As early as 1950 Russell and Shrode referred to bibliotherapy as a process of dynamic interaction which may be utilized for personality assessment, adjustment, and growth. Davis (1972) points out that books can play a part in creating self-image in the early formative years. Hoagland (1972) states that books are an aid to children in the development of personality. Certain books could provide standards of behavior and suggest attitudes which might help children cope with problems caused by physical or emotional handicaps.

**A great part of the physically handicapped child's difficulty comes from the way other people react to him and from the image he forms on the basis of their reactions.**

In 1974, Beulah Moody, a graduate student in Special Education at the University of Pittsburgh did an interesting study to which I am deeply indebted for many of the references and much of the information in this article. Her paper, "A Comparison of the Preference of Handicapped and Nonhandicapped Preschoolers in Story Books with Handicapped and Nonhandicapped Characters" describes the reactions of preschoolers (handicapped and nonhandicapped) to books for preschoolers and about handicapped and nonhandicapped characters. Although this study was conducted on a population of only 35 children, the results could probably be replicated with a larger preschool population. To support the need of specific story books

*Fran Cohen, M. Ed.: Pre-Primary Teacher, Rogers School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

for handicapped children, Mrs Moody quotes Kirk (1972):

> "Because society has placed a premium on physical strength, beauty, and ability, it is easy for a crippled child to devaluate himself because he does not have those qualities. He sometimes needs help in realizing that while he lacks those qualities, he has others which are also of value." (p. 374).

Stone and Church (1954) state:

> "A great part of the physically handicapped child's difficulty comes from the way other people react to him from the image he forms on the basis of their reactions." (P. 353).

Cohen (1971) states that:

> "Three major drives need to be satisfied in early childhood programs. One is curiosity, a second is interest in other children, and a third is the handling of emotional impulses. All three take a lifetime to fulfill, but it is in early childhood that the shape of fulfillment takes place" (p. 286).

These three quotations advance the idea that now that some handicapped preschoolers are being mainstreamed such books are important because they may be of interest and help to the handicapped preschooler by giving the child positive, realistic goals with which to identify and by aiding him/her in coping with unique daily challenges. Also, they realistically emphasize what he cannot do. In addition, such books may be of value to his classmates by reaffirming that the differences between them are less numerous than what they have in common. By removing some of the potentially awesome and fearful aspects of the differences that do exist, these books would thus ultimately help create an atmosphere of acceptance, understanding, and helpfulness between them.

It is the fervent hope of this reviewer that authors, illustrators, and publishers of children's books will soon do something to fill this void of suitable picture stories for and about handicapped preschoolers and about their interactions in the mainstream school environment and that organizations and foundations such as the March of Dimes, Easter Seals, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations can be enlisted, if necessary, to subsidize or perhaps even commission such works. In the meantime, listed below is a review of the books that are presently on the market. It is interesting to note that they were just published in the last year of two. Perhaps this is a hopeful sign that in the next few years we can look forward to the publication of more books of a relevant nature at the preschool level.

*Jon O.* Ominsky, E., New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1977.

Jon O. is, and always will be, different. Since he was born with Down's Syndrome, he has been slower to develop, has more problems learning, even simple everyday things, and there are some things, many things, he will never be able to learn or to do. The book realistically faces these facts and the frustration and sadness they engender. But, emphasis is placed on what he can do and enjoys doing. He is shown interacting positively with his supportive family and with his nonhandicapped friends and classmates. Fine black and white photographs accompany the relatively brief text on each page. *Leo the Leo the Late Bloomer.* Kraus, Robert. New York: Windmill Books & E. P. Dutton, 1971.

Although this book deals with what only turns out to be a temporary handicap, its imaginative text and charming color illustrations have led to its inclusion here. For a very long time it appears that a lovely tiger named Leo just can't manage to do anything right. While his diverse animal friends are busy acquiring and displaying a variety of skills, Leo feels more and more hopeless. His father too, is becoming impatient and keeps watching Leo for signs of "blooming." Only his mother seems confident that in time and in the absence of his father's display of anxiety, Leo will make it. Her confidence and patience are richly rewarded.

*A Look at Physical Handicaps.* Forrai, M.S. and Pursell, M. Minneapolis: Lerner Publications Co., 1976.

This book of fine black and white photographs attempts to give an overview of various physical handicaps (temporary, permanent, congenital, acquired). The problems that the handicapped face in coping with the "normal" world are not minimized. How-

ever, emphasis is placed on the idea that they, like everyone else, also have strengths on which to build and that there are people and prosthetic devices who will aid them in doing so.

*Howie Helps Himself.* Fassler, J. Chicago: Albert Whitman & Co., 1975.

Howie's mind works well, but he needs lots of help physically because there are many necessary things he cannot do by and for himself. There are numerous people, both within his family, and outside of it, who care about Howie and who, with the aid of interesting and ingenious devices, help him. Like all of us, especially all growing children, Howie has a strong desire for greater independence and strives to do what he can despite his malfunctioning hands and feet. Howie, who is in a wheelchair, feels a great sense of achievement and mastery when he, through prolonged and prodigious effort, is finally able to propel his wheelchair by himself.

*Jay and the Marigold.* Robinet, H. Chicago: Children's Press, 1976.

Cerebral palsy has rendered Jay virtually helpless physically and has severely impaired his powers of communications. He can only roll over and make noises. Jay's senses are intact, his powers of observation are keen. He is a sensitive, perceptive, and mentally alert human being. He is also an isolated and lonely little boy who has little satisfactory contact with people outside his own family. One day he discovers a marigold attempting to grow in the unfavorable environment of a small crack in his concrete steps and failing to thrive. He secures aid in nurturing it. Although its growth is stunted, it eventually does produce a spectacular bloom which for him seems to symbolize a hope that he too will find a way to "flower." Unfortunately, this is a rather long and somewhat complex story for preschoolers.

*He's My Brother.* Lasker, J. Chicago: Albert Whitman & Co., 1974.

Teased, scorned by his peers, and unable to fend for himself socially or cope with the simple management problems of daily life, this youngster with an invisible handicap suffers much sadness and frustration. But, nevertheless there are things he loves and enjoys, like animals and babies, and outlets for the frustration, like playing his drums loudly. While his family, particularly the brother who purportedly has written this book about him, does not find life with him particularly easy, he has gained their love and support and even admiration for his qualities of good will and kindness.

This is another good story but more suited to the young elementary school child than to the preschooler.

## REFERENCES


*A parent's guide to children's reading.* Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday, 1972.

*Best books for children.* New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1972.

Cohen, D. Continuity from pre-kindergarten to kindergarten. *Young Children,* 1971, **26**[5], 286.

Davis, M. W. Bibliotherapy. *Elementary English,* November 1972.

Garver, K. *Pittsburgh Post Gazette,* January 31, 1974, p. 11.

Hoagland, J. A. Teachers of english. *Elementary English,* March 1972.

Kirk, S. *Educating exceptional children.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Mattern, L. B. A problem. *The Lyre,* Winter 1973 - Spring 1974.

Moody, Beulah C. A comparison of the preferences of handicapped and non-handicapped preschoolers in story books with handicapped or nonhandicapped characters. Unpublished paper, University of Pittsburgh, 1974.

Mullins, J. & Wolfe, S. *Behind the 8 ball.* Johnstown, Penna.: Mafex Associates, Inc., 1975.

Russell, D. H. & Shrode, C. Contributions of research in bibliotherapy to the language arts program. *School Review,* October 1950, LVIII.

Stone L. J. & Church, J. *Childhood and adolescence.* New York: Random House, 1964.

*Subject guide to children's books in print.* New York: Bowker, 1971.

# COVER DRAWING

*by Judith Rubin*

Working with a handicapped child requires a new kind of receptivity on the part of the teacher, especially one who is not familiar with such youngsters. If we are open to the handicapped child's unique way of being, we can learn to value his otherness, to treasure the ways in which he can sensitize us to the nature of his experience. He can then enable us to revise our usual perception of "handicap" as primarily "defect" to primarily "difference." For, indeed, there are values and beauty in his different ways of perceiving, knowing, and creating. With an awareness of these, we can expand our notion of "art" to include a broad range of possible creative activities and can clarify the truly relevant goals of art for the disabled child.

Once, while I was conducting a study of the perception of a "tactile aesthetic" at the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, I met a young woman who opened up a whole new world of thinking for me. She was thirteen, wore glasses, and responded to the sculptures in the study using what little vision she possessed. She selected her favorite wood scrap construction because, as she explained, it reminded her of herself.

> "This one is more interesting. It has a real slant, and I like it because it sort of depicts my personality. It's weird. It's real jutty and different. It sort of represents something in my life. I don't know what. Maybe it's part of my personality--that'd be too big and clumsy and jutty--out every which way!"

My own interest was stimulated by so much psychological sophistication in one so young, and I asked her some questions. She then shared with me a "secret" about a way she had privately discovered of using art forms to help her deal with the overwhelming feeling--states characteristic of adolescence. "Sometimes," she said, "I get so emotional. I just do the weirdest things, you know? I don't know... But there's this one desire--and I'll never get to really understand myself and understand these feelings--and what's causin' them." She had found that it helped her if she tried to capture such feelings through writing a poem or composing music. She also created with clay "personality globs," and with felt markers "mind pictures," by using her own meditative technique. She would pause, close her eyes, sit very still, and then do "whatever my brain and hands tell me to do." It was in such a fashion that she created the "mind picture" illustrated below.

My young friend distinguished between drawings produced under such conditions of relaxation and those produced by using her limited vision. With eyes close to the paper, with evident effort, she created the house seen on the cover. "I'm more free--like I feel more like myself--when I draw something indirect," like a "mind picture." She went on to explain, however, that "I also feel like myself when I'm thinking that thing, like when I think about houses and I draw a house--I feel good, you know."

I think she was telling me that she needed both kinds of opportunities in the arts: the kinds of tasks which required her to deal realistically with the external world, using all the perceptual-motor skills at her command; and the kinds which invited her to cope with her internal world, which allowed her to behave with freedom and spontaneity despite her handicap. Since the arts will hopefully become increasingly available to handicapped youngsters, it is important to hear her message--and to respond by providing both educational and therapeutic opportunities for learning and expression through creative activity.

---

*Judith Rubin, Ph.D., ATR: Art Therapist, Pittsburgh Child Guidance Center; Clinical Assistant Professor, Child Psychiatry & Health Related Professions, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.*

(Continued from page 75)

"mainstreaming." However, preciseness in the use of language is paramount in law and many other disciplines. For that reason, if no other, the term should be discarded in favor of "least restrictive environment." But under whatever catch-term we use, implementation of the concept in the "spirit" of the law as well as by the "letter" of the law is what should be important.

## FOOTNOTES

1 20 USC 1412 (5) (B) and 45 CFR §84.34.
2 45 CFR §84.4 (b) (2).
3 45 CFR §121a551.
4 Ibid.
5 45 CFR §121a.552.
6 CFR §84.34 (a).
7 45 CFR §121a.550 (b) (2).
8 41 Federal Register 56986 (1976).
9 See, DAS Bulletin #5, November 17, 1977.
10 20 U.S.C. 1401 (17).
11 45 CFR §84.33 (b).
12 45 CFR §84.22
13 Ibid.
14 45 CFR §84.23.

The above Footnotes are also referenced in:

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law No. 94-142, 20 U.S.C. 1401 and *Congressional Record*, November 1975, Washington, D.C.

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 93-112 and the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1974; Public Law 93-510, 29 United States Code 706, 794.

## REFERENCES

(Continued from page 77)

Brill, R. Mainstreaming: Format or quality? *Audiology and Hearing Education*, April/May 1976, **32**, 13-16.

Budoff, M. & Gottlieb, J. Special-class EMR children mainstreamed: a study of an aptitude (learning potential) in treatment interaction. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, July 1976, **81[1]**.

Calhoun, G. & Elliot, R. Self concept and academic achievement of educable retarded and emotionally disturbed pupils. *Exceptional Children*, March 1977, **43[6]**, 379-380.

Connor, L. Mainstreaming a special school. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, Winter 1976, **8[2]**, 76-80.

Haring, N. & Krug, D. Placement in regular programs: Procedures & results. *Exceptional Children*, March 1975, **41[6]**, 413-417.

Nix, G. Mainstream placement question/checklist. *Volta Review*, September 1977, **79[5]**, 345-348.

Snyder, L., Apolloni, T., & Cooke, T. Integrated settings at the early childhood level: The role of nonretarded peers. *Exceptional Children*, February 1977, **43[5]**, 262-266.

What is mainstreaming? *Exceptional Children*, November 1975, **42[3]**, 174.

(Continued from page 80)

ments. Some teachers are too solicitous while other teachers completely ignore these children or feel they should not be in a regular classroom. Through this move to a regular school, our daughter has been able to develop and mature to the extent that she is able to recognize these attitudes of her teachers and to try to understand them. But the hurt is hard to erase.

We have found that parents cannot and must not take a back seat and watch the potential of their child go down the drain. We have to be very realistic; if a child has the potential he/she must be encouraged, but if he/she does not this too must be accepted and worked with.

In the special school many of the physcial need were met, but we found that academically and psychologically our child's needs were not. As a result, she was not achieving her full potential. Unless her potential is recognized and encouraged, she will not be able to become independent, and, therefore, she will become a burden rather than an asset to society. We feel that mainstreaming is a step toward independence for our daughter. It frightens us to think of what would happen to our beautiful daughter if we died and she was thrown into a society where she must stand on her own and is unprepared. This question has to be answered by us and by society.

(Continued from page 88)

*special education: A guide to better education for the handicapped*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.

Wolf, J. *Designing and implementing a mainstream course for regular early educators*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116278).

Wolfensberger, W. *Normalization*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation, 1972.

Zemanek, D., & Lehrer, B. The role of university departments of special education in mainstreaming. *Exceptional Children,* March 1977, 377-379.

**FILMS**

*All together now.* Reston, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1974. (Cassette album)

Individualized educational programming. Instructional Media, 1977. (Film)

---

(Continued from page 83)

cation for the Handicapped has stated:

> We must avoid the ignoring of weakness in a well-designed and intentional system because we are afraid the exposure will hurt our cause. We should not allow our belief in the promises of mainstreaming to silence us if we see faults in its application. We must look for and offer remediations for these faults. With the newly recognized rights of children to education we offer, we must all assume an equal responsibility in seeing that these rights are truly fulfilled. (Martin, 1975, p. 5)

It is clear that the concept of mainstream has great potential for providing effective and appropriate education which will later enable handicapped children to function as independent adults. Yet only through careful implementation can the promise of mainstreaming be fulfilled. Implementation will not be an easy task. If we sweep the problems under the rug, the task will be impossible.

---

**REFERENCES**

Abeson, A., & Zettel J. The end of the quiet revolution: The education for all handicapped children act of 1975. *Exceptional Children,* 1977, 114-128.

Hobbs, N. *The futures of children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Keogh, B. K., & Levitt, M. L. Special education in the mainstream: A confrontation of limitations. *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 1976, 1-11.

Lippman, L. Normalization and related concepts: Words and ambiguities. *Child Welfare,* 1977, **56**[5], 29-32.

MacMillan, D. L., & Semmel, M. I. Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 1977, 1-14.

Martin, E. Integration of the handicapped child into regular schools. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Mainstreaming: Origins and Implications.* Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Polloway, E. A., & Snell, M. E. Efficacy revisited. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded,* 1975, 276-283.

Schleifier, M. The school year has been a total disaster. *The Exceptional Parent,* 1977, **7**[4], 22-26.

Winschel, J. F. Mainstreaming no. *The Exceptional Parent,* 1976, **6**[1], 6-8.

# BACK ISSUES

**TOYS IN A THROWAWAY SOCIETY:**
*Volume 5, Number 4, April, 1972*

**CHILDHOOD SCHIZOPHRENIA:**
*Volume 6, Number 1, October, 1972*

**PARENT EDUCATION:**
*Volume 6, Number 2, November, 1972*

**EXPLAINING DEATH TO YOUNG CHILDREN:**
*Volume 6, Number 3, February, 1973*

**HIGH RISK INFANTS AND THE PRACTICE OF NEONATOLOGY:**
*Volume 6, Number 4, April, 1973*

**CHILD ADVOCACY:**
*Volume 7, Number 1, October, 1973*

**DIVORCE AND THE YOUNG CHILD:**
*Volume 7, Number 2, November, 1973*

**THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION:**
*Volume 7, Number 3, February, 1974*

**FATHERHOOD:**
*Volume 7, Number 4, April, 1974*

**ADOPTION:**
*Volume 8, Number 1, October, 1974*

**EXPRESSIVE ART THERAPY:**
*Volume 8, Number 2, November, 1974*

**THE INFANT:**
*Volume 8, Number 3, February, 1975*

**LEARNING DISORDERS AND YOUNG CHILDREN:**
*Volume 8, Number 4, April, 1975*

**YOUNG CHILDREN: POLITICAL ISSUES AND PUBLIC POLICY:**
*Volume 9, Number 1, November, 1975*

**YOUNG CHILDREN: LEGAL ISSUES AND PUBLIC POLICY:**
*Volume 9, Number 2, February, 1976*

**PLAY: VARIATIONS ON A THEME:**
*Volume 9, Number 3, March, 1976*

**PLAY AND THE SPECIAL CHILD:**
*Volume 9, Number 4, May, 1976*

**MEDICAL ISSUES AND YOUNG CHILDREN:**
*Volume 10, Number 1, November, 1976*

**FAMILY DAY CARE:**
*Volume 10, Number 2, January, 1977*

**ECONOMIC ISSUES AND YOUNG CHILDREN:**
*Volume 10, Number 3, March, 1977*

**THE HOSPITALIZED CHILD:**
*Volume 10, Number 4, May, 1977*

Rate: $3.00 per copy
Mail request to : Children in Contemporary Society:
P.O. Box 11173, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237

**Make checks payable to: The Pittsburgh Area Preschool Association**
**All orders should be accompanied by payment.**

Name: _____

Address: _____

Amount Enclosed: _____